



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,573	06/24/2003	Yu-Chong Tai	049411-0248	3326
22428 7590 10/19/2009 FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP SUITE 500 3000 K STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20007				
EXAMINER				
JARRETT, LORE RAMILLANO				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1797				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/19/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/603,573

**Applicant(s)**

TAI ET AL.

**Examiner**

LORE JARRETT

**Art Unit**

1797

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/17/09.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 8-13, 17-19, 22-26 and 30-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 8-13, 17-19, 22-26 and 30-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 6/24/03 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Status of Claims***

1. In applicant's reply filed on 6/17/09, applicant amended claims 1, 23, and 24. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-13, 17-19, 22-26, and 30-33 are pending and under examination.

### ***Response to Amendment***

#### ***Prior art rejections***

2. The rejections over the prior art are maintained.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claims 1-4, 6, 8-13, 17-19, 22-23, 25-26, and 30-33** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lazar et al. ("Lazar," US Pub. No. 2004/0208751).

Lazar discloses the structural limitations of applicant's invention. In particular, Lazar discloses a microfluidic system comprising a substrate (i.e. microchip platform, [0026]), an electrochemical pump system on the substrate, the electrochemical pump system comprising a plurality of electrolysis pumps, in which one is a sample injector, configured in parallel and/or sequential (i.e. [0026]) and having at least one outlet; each

of the electrolysis pumps comprising: a chamber (i.e. [0038]); a plurality of electrodes, which are coupled to an electrical source (i.e. 30, voltage power source, [0027]); a fluid inside the chamber, and the fluid in contact with the electrodes, wherein the fluid comprises a gas phase and a liquid phase (i.e. [0028], [0068], [0031]); an inlet and an outlet (i.e. 14, 16, [0027]); a separation column on the substrate having an inlet, an outlet, a microchannel, a solid stationary phase material packed inside the microchannel, the inlet of the separation column being coupled to at least one outlet of the electrochemical pump; and wherein the electrochemical pump system and the separation column are configured such that the electrochemical pump system provides an elution for a separation process (i.e. [0029], [0031], [0061]).

Lazar further discloses: a gradient elution (i.e. [0047]), a sample source (i.e. [0029]), mixers (i.e. [0026]), a nozzle (i.e. 32, [0029]) that is coupled to an electrospray ionization-mass spectrometry (ESI-MS) (i.e. [0026]), a detection device (i.e. optical detectors, [0026]), and a pump system and separation column constructed from injection molding, photolithography, dry etching, wet etching, and other microfabrication techniques (i.e. [0037]).

As to the pending claims above, which contain intended use terms, the Examiner will interpret these claims in light of the structural elements that are disclosed and not for their intended use as stated after the terms, i.e. "for," "adapted to," and "configured to." The terms, "for," "adapted to," and "configured to" are intended use terms. A recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus

satisfying the claimed structural limitations. Furthermore, a structure, which is capable of providing the intended use, is considered to meet the limitation of intended use recited in a claim to a device or an apparatus. Therefore, the Examiner has applied the reference, Lazar, because Lazar's structural limitations are capable of meeting these recited functions.

As to claim 33, the claim language recited in this claim appears to recite a product-by-process claim because it recites the method of construction. Because the method of forming the claimed invention does not contribute to the patentability of a device or an apparatus claim, Lazar's disclosure properly reads on this limitation.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
6. **Claim 24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazar in view of Kaduce et al. ("Kaduce," *A rapid, isocratic method for phospholipids separation by high-performance liquid chromatograph*, 1983).

Lazar discloses the following: see paragraph 7 above.

Lazar does not specifically disclose utilizing a fluid that is selected from a group consisting of acetonitrile, methanol, ethanol, tetrahydrofuran, isopropanol, and toluene.

Kaduce discloses a rapid, isocratic method for separating the most prevalent phospholipids by high-performance liquid chromatography. Kaduce further discloses utilizing acetonitrile and methanol to conduct the HPLC analysis (i.e. page 1398, second column). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to modify Lazar by including acetonitrile and methanol in Lazar's invention. Lazar specifically discloses utilizing a chromatography device. Kaduce teaches that it is known in the art to utilize liquids such as acetonitrile and methanol for these types of devices (page 1401, second column).

### ***Double Patenting***

7. The double patenting rejection is maintained.

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No.

11/177,505. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both claims recite substantially the same subject matter, differing in the inclusion of multiple electrodes recited in the instant claims. Both

claims recite a substrate, a chromatography column (separation column), and a pump system (electrochemical pump system). It would have been obvious to provide multiple electrodes within the device of claim 1 of application 11/177505 in order to ensure that the electroosmotic flow in the microchannels is moving in the desired direction (Lazar, [0028]). This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments filed 6/17/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that Lazar's invention does not teach a fluid comprising a gas phase and a liquid phase, the Office respectfully does not find this argument to be persuasive. While features of an apparatus may be recited either structurally or functionally, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. Here, the newly added claim language in claim 1 does not appear to limit the structure of the claimed apparatus since it recites the state of a fluid. Examiner recommends including supported subject matter that is structurally distinguishable from the prior art to overcome the prior art.

### ***Conclusion***

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LORE JARRETT whose telephone number is (571)272-7420. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. to Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on (571) 272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/LORE JARRETT/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1797

10/11/09